		_		eet - Grazing Lands CMS Field No's.			
ribal Land	Non-Tribal La	nd		Preliminary Rating	Final Rat	ting	
	1. PI	antsPo	tential l	Points (25-50% of To	otal)		
tocking rate base tocking rate for irr	d of evaluation use d on MLRA, etc. <u>OR</u> rigated lands. Do not	% Area in Contra		% Area in Contract After Treatment.	Potential Points	Bench- mark Points	After Points
use both. Grazing Plan	Intensive Rotation				Highest		
	Seasonal Use						
	Continuous Use				0	0	0
	>90% of Growing S	eason			Highest		
Deferrment	51-90% of Growing	Season					
Period	26-50% of Growing Season						
	0-25% of Growing S				Lowest		
tocking Rate	highest no. acres	Acres/ 1 AUM			Highest		
ased On:		Acres/ 1 AUM					
ILRA ITE		Acres/ 1 AUM					
l: 26-50	lowest no. acres	Acres/ 1 AUM			Lowest		
(Irr Lands)	highest no. acres	Acres/ 1 AUM					
Stocking Rate Based on Soils		Acres/ 1 AUM					
Data & Ag Tech		Acres/ 1 AUM					
bata a rig 100ii	lowest no. acres	Acres/ 1 AUM					
Note 41							
2. Co ny practice use perations must hould be given t	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of the concerns, are cost effective, with Criteria Children.		% of Total Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Sele	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must hould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After Points
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must hould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must hould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must hould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must hould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must nould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Co ny practice use perations must hould be given t	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After
2. Cony practice use perations must hould be given to	enservation Pr d in the ranking crite be a cost-shared pra to those practices wh	ractice(s) Selection in the selection of	e included entive paym resource o	Potential Points in the conservation plan of nent. Higher priority (value) concerns, are cost effective,	s (25-65% Potential	Percent of Need to be	After

3. Other Considerations - \_\_\_\_ Potential Points (10-25% of Total)

## NM EQIP FY 2005 Ranking Criteria Worksheet - Grazing Lands - \_\_\_\_\_ F.O.

Items A thru D are required. If there are other criteria the D.C. wants to recommend based on LWG advice, please include them as item E.		Bench- mark Points	After Points
A. At risk species habitat will be enhanced. (List the species impacted)		0	
B. Treatment of this land could have a beneficial impact on a 303d listed stream segment.		0	
C. Treatment of this land could enhance the benefits of an active or planned sec. 309 project.		0	
D. The land is within a NMED designated Category I watershed.		0	
E. Other LWG/DC recommended criteria?		0	
3. Other Considerations	Total:	0	

Total Points (After minus Benchmark): Section	1 Section 2	Section 3	Total for Worksheet	*						
*A minimum of total points must be earned to be considered for contract selection.										
Designated Conservationist	Date									

Revised Nov. 2004